

REMARKS

The Examiner has interpreted the “switching component” as “a mouse used by a user to switch from one website to another as was known in the art” in Claims 78-117. The Applicant has amended claims 78, 87, 93 and 108 such that the claims now refer to a “switching component in the Web application” to distinguish the switching component away from a mouse used by a user.

The Examiner raises an objection pertaining to an intermediate device or service network 350 that switches the user and allows the user to communicate with a second server. The objection is overcome by modifying claims 78, 87, 93 and 108 to include the term “an object router.” See Specification, pg. 11, par. 0051; pg.13, par 0054.

The Examiner rejects claims 78-81, 83, 84, 86-89, 91-95, 97-106, 108-111, 113-115, 117 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent number 5,870,724 to Lawlor et al. in view of the Applicant’s (Purported) Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

The Applicant has modified claims 78, 87, 93 and 108 to replace “sellers” with “Web merchants” and included the further elements of a “Web application” and “object router”—all of which are absent from the combination posited by the Examiner. In light of this amendment, the rejection is overcome.

The Examiner’s proposed combination, with respect to claims 79 and 109, fails to disclose a “switching component in the Web application.”

With respect to claims 80 and 110, the Examiner’s proposed combination fails to disclose a “Web application” and “object router.”

The Examiner's proposed combination fails to disclose a "Web application" and an "object router" as well as "Web transactions" and "Web merchant" with respect to claims 81 and 111.

With respect to claims 83, 97, and 113, the proposed combination fails to disclose a "Web application" and "Web transactions."

A "Web application" and an "object router" as well as "Web transactions" are absent from the proposed rejection as it pertains to claim 84.

The Examiner's proposed rejection fails to disclose a "Web application" and "object router" whereby the rejection of claims 86 and 91 is overcome.

The disclosure of a "Web application" and "object router" are absent with respect to dependent claim 88.

By modifying the independent claims to include "Web application" and "object router" and dependent claim 89 to include "Web transaction" and "Web merchants," the rejection of claim 89 is overcome.

The recitation of a "Web application" and "object router" causes the rejection of dependent claim 92 to be overcome.

The cited art fails to disclose a "Web application" and "object router" as well as a "service network atop the Web" and in "real-time" with respect to dependent claim 94.

The rejection of claim 95 fails to address a "Web application" and "object router."

The rejection of claim 98 fails to disclose a "Web application" and "object router."

Claim 99 and 107 both require a “Web application,” “Web merchants” and “object router”; dependent claims 100 and 114 further require a “Web user.” Said teachings being lacking from the art, the corresponding rejections are overcome.

Dependent claims 101, 102, and 115 require, at least, a “Web application,” “Web merchant” and “Web user”; said elements are lacking from the art and the rejection is overcome.

Claim 103 requires a “Web application,” “Web merchants,” and “object router” all of which are lacking in the Examiner’s rejection as is the case with claim 104, 105, and 106.

Claims 82, 96, 104, 108, 112, and 117 requires a “Web application,” “Web merchants,” and “object router”; said elements are lacking in the rejection, which is thereby overcome.

The rejection of claims 85, 90, 107, and 116 are overcome in that it relies upon the Krichilsky reference, which fails to disclose a Web application. The rejection is, therefore, overcome.

As per the Examiner’s request for clarification of how the switching component allows users to communicate with the payment program in Claim 78, the Applicant respectfully clarifies that the switching component in a Web application allows Web users performing Web transactions from a Web application to communicate with the payment program via object routing. Support for this is available profusely in the specification of the current patent application, as well as in the parent—U.S. patent number 5,778, 178— and U.S. provisional application 60/006, 634. Reference to Figures 5A, 5B, 5C, 6A, 7, and Col. 7, Ln. 46 - Col. 9, Ln. 24 are likewise relevant in the ‘178 Patent.

As per Examiner's request for clarification of claim 78, such as indicating which server the second Web page is supported by in Claim 78, the Applicant has appropriately modified Claim 78 to include a Web application on any Web page supported by any Web server.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that allowable subject matter is presented as a result of these amendments and allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Lakshmi Arunachalam

September 22, 2010

By: /Tam Thanh Pham/
Tam Thanh Pham (50,565)
CARR & FERRELL LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
650.812.3400
650.812.3444